IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1979

NO. 79-5741

WAYNE EUGENE RITTER,

PETITIONER,

VS.

STATE OF ALABAMA,

RESPONDENT.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE

SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

CHARLES A. GRADDICK
ALABAMA ATTORNEY GENERAL

JACK M. CURTIS
ALABAMA ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	iv
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
PROCEEDINGS BELOW	1
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS	2
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	4
ARGUMENT	6
THE PRECLUSION OF LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES WAS NOT UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE BECAUSE THERE WAS NO EVIDENTIARY BASIS FOR THEM	6
THE ALABAMA SENTENCING PROCEDURE AT THE TRIAL COURT LEVEL IS CONSTITUTIONAL	22
ALABAMA DOES PROVIDE APPELLATE REVIEW OF CAPITAL SENTENCES	35
ALABAMA'S STATUTE OPERATES TO REQUIRE PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT OF AT LEAST ONE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCE AND ALL THE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES CONSIDERED IN THIS CASE WERE PROVEN BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT	45
THE OVERALL OPERATION OF ALABAMA'S STATUTE IS NOT UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND IT DID NOT OPERATE TO PREJUDICE RITTER IN ANY WAY	50
THE PETITIONER KNOWINGLY AND VOLUNTARILY WAIVED ANY ERRORS IN THE COURT'S CHARGE TO THE JURY	51
CONCLUSION	53
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	54

TABLE OF CASES

	PAGE
Beck v. State, 365 So. 2d 985 (1978) aff'd 365 So. 2d 1006 (Ala. 1978) cert. granted _____ U. S. _____ (1979)	23,30,37,41
Bowman v. State, 44 Ala. App. 331, 208 So. 241 (1968)	9,10
Broadrick v. Oklahoma, 413 U. S. 601, 610 (1973)	18
Callahan v. State, 343 So. 2d 551 (Ala. Cr. App. 1977)	18
Clements v. State, 370 So. 2d 723 (Ala. 1979)	11,40
Cooke v. State, 369 So. 2d 1251, 1256 (1979)	25
Cooper v. State, 364 So. 2d 382, 387 (Ala. Cr. App., cert. denied 364 So. 2d 388 (Ala. 1978)	18
Dobbert v. Florida, 432 U. S. 282, 300, 301 (1977)	21
Evans v. State, 361 So. 2d 654 (Ala. Cr. App. 1977) aff'd 361 So. 2d 666 (Ala. 1978) cert. denied, 404 U. S. 930 (1979)	2,38
Evans (Leslie) v. State, 362 So. 2d 1284	42
Ex Parte Hughley Water System, 282 Ala. 633, 213 So. 2d 799, 805 (Ala. 1968)	48
Fulgham v. State, 291 Ala. 71, 277 So. 2d 886, 890 (1973)	9,20

TABLE OF CASES (CONT'D)

	PAGE
Furman v. Georgia, 408 U. S. 238 (1972)	27,28,31,39
Gardner v. Florida, 430 U. S. 349, 357, 358 (1977)	23
Golston v. State, 57 Ala. App. 623, 330 So. 2d 446 (1975)	9,10,18,19
Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U. S. 153 (1976)	5,12,13,16, 20,23,31,32, 35,39,45
Hackman v. State, 41 Ala. App. 642, 644, 148 So. 2d 253 (1962)	17
Harris v. State, 44 Ala. App. 654, 219 So. 2d 410, 413 (1969)	9,10
Harvest v. State, 342 So. 2d 1369, 1372 (Ala. Cr. App. 1977)	9
Hunter v. State, 335 So. 2d 194, 200 (Ala. Cr. App.) Cert. denied 335 So. 2d 203 (Ala. 1976)	18
Jacobs (John L.) v. State, 371 So. 2d 448 (Ala. 1979)	11,17,25,32,39
Jacobs v. State, 361 So. 2d 640, 644 (Ala. 1978)	23,34,36,39 40,41,46
Johnson v. State, 94 Ala. 35, 41, 10 So. 667 (1891)	18
Juret v. Texas, 428 U. S. 274	35
Keeble v. United States, 412 U. S. 205 (1973)	8,15

TABLE OF CASES (CON'T)

	PAGE
Kelly v. State, 235 Ala. 5, 176 So. 807, 808 (1937)	10
Knight v. State, 50 Ala. App. 39, 276 So. 624 (1973)	16
Tommy Lewis v. State, ____ So. 2d ____ (Ala. Cr. App. 1979)	42,43,44
Lockett v. Ohio, 438 U. S. 586, 601 (1978)	14,23,25,26,30
Lowery v. State, 294 Ala. 347, 317 So. 2d 360 (1975)	17
McGuffin v. State, 178 Ala. 40, 59 So. 635 (1912)	17
Willie Lewis Mack v. State, 375 So. 2d 476 (Ala. Cr. App. 1978) aff'd 375 So. 2d 504 (Ala. 1979)	24
Martin v. State, 56 Ala. App. 33, 318 So. 2d 772 cert. denied 294 Ala. 765 318 So. 2d 775 (1975)	18
Methvin v. United States, 441 F. 2d 584, 586 (5rh Cir., 1971) cert. denied 404 U. S. 839	8
Miller v. State, 40 So. 47 (Ala. 1906)	18
Morris v. State 47 Ala. App. 132, 251 So. 2d 629, 633 (1971)	18
Neal v. State, 372 So. 2d 1331, 1337 (Ala. Cr. App. App.)	38,42

TABLE OF CASES (CONT'D)

	PAGE
Tony Randolph Nolen v. State, ___ So. 2d ___ (Ala. Cr. App. 1979)	33,34,42
Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U. S. 248, n. 6 (1976)	25,30,31,35,36 38,39,41,42,46
Prothro v. State, 370 So. 2d 740 (Ala. Cr. App. 1979)	20,42
Pruett v. Patton 288 Ala. 710, 265 So. 2d 130, 133 (1972)	48
Herbert Lee Richardson v. State, ___ So. 2d ___ (Ala. Cr. App. 1978)	36,38
Richmond v. Arizona, 434 U. S. 1323 (1977)	30
Ritter v. State, 375 So. 2d 270, 275,276 (Ala. 1979)	52
Roberts (Harry) v. Louisiana, 431 U. S. 633 (1977)	45
Roberts (Staninlaus) v. Louisiana, 428 U. S. 325, 330 (1976)	13,26,28,29,32
Samsome v. United States, 380 U. S. 343, 350 (1965)	7,8,20
Smith v. State, 53 Ala. App. 141, 298 So. 2d 71 (1974)	17
Spinkellink v. Wainwright, 578 F. 2d 582, 610 (5th Cir. 1978)	45,46
State v. Debra Bracewell, ___ So. 2d ___ (Ala. 1979)	44
State v. Simants, 197 Neb. 549, 250 N. W. 2d 881, 887 (Neb. 1977)	30,45,49
Thomas v. State, 373 So. 2d 1167 (1979)	37

TABLE OF CASES (CONT'D)

	PAGE
United States v. Flint, 534 F. 2d 60 (5th Cir.) cert. denied 429 U. S. 924 (1976)	8
United States v. Madden, 525 F. 2d 972, 973 (5th Cir. 1976)	8
Watters v. State, 369 So. 2d 1272 (Ala. 1979)	11
Whitehead v. State, 206 Ala. 288, 90 So. 351 (1921)	9
Wilkinson v. State, 50 Ala. App. 150, 277 So. 2d 423 cert. denied 291 Ala. 802, 277 So. 2d 427 (1973)	18
Witherspoon v. Illinois, 391 U. S. 510 (1968)	30
Woodson v. North Carolina, 428 U. S. 305	23,26,27,29 32,39,42
Youngblood v. State, 372 So. 2d 34	42

TABLE OF STATUTES

	PAGE
Title 14, Section 415, Code of Alabama 1940 (Recompiled 1958)	10
Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-1-73	10,11
Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-2(a)	11,16,21,22,46
Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-73	11
Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-1-70	17
Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-1-90	18
Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-3	22,24
Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-4	22,23,46,47
Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-6	25,47,49
Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-7	25
Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-5	35,43
Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-1	1

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1979

NO. 79-5741

WAYNE EUGENE RITTER,

PETITIONER,

VS.

STATE OF ALABAMA,

RESPONDENT.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE

SUPREME COURT OF ALABAMA

RESPONDENT'S BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

The Respondent, State of Alabama, respectfully requests that this Court deny the petition for writ of certiorari, seeking review of the Supreme Court of Alabama opinion in this case. That opinion is reported at 375 So. 2d 270 (1979).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I.

WHETHER THE FAILURE TO INSTRUCT A JURY IN A CAPITAL CASE ON NON-CAPITAL LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL IF THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO EVIDENTIARY BASIS TO SUPPORT A VERDICT ON THE LESSER OFFENSES?

II.

WHETHER THE SENTENCING PROCEDURE PROVIDED IN THE ALABAMA CAPITAL PUNISHMENT STATUTE IS CONSTITUTIONAL?

III.

WHETHER ALABAMA PROVIDES FOR COMPARATIVE APPELLATE REVIEW OF SENTENCING IN CAPITAL CASES?

IV.

WHETHER THE ALABAMA CAPITAL PUNISHMENT STATUTE INSOFAR AS IT CONCERNS PROOF OF AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES IS CONSTITUTIONAL?

V.

WHETHER ALABAMA'S CAPITAL PUNISHMENT STATUTE VIOLATED ANY OF RITTER'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN VIEW OF HIS UNUSUAL COURSE OF CONDUCT AT HIS TRIAL.

VI.

WHETHER THE PETITIONER'S VOLUNTARY AND KNOWING WAIVER OF ERROR IN THE TRIAL COURT'S CHARGE TO THE JURY PRESENTS ANY CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION FOR REVIEW BY THIS COURT?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

PROCEEDINGS BELOW

The Petitioner, Wayne Eugene Ritter, was indicted on April 8, 1977 under Alabama's post-Furman Capital punishment statute, Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-1, et seq., for the robbery-homicide of Edward A. Nassar, a Mobile, Alabama pawnbroker (R. 20). Petitioner was arraigned in open court on April 18, 1977 at which time he entered a plea of guilty (R. 55 - 62).

Trial commenced on April 26, 1977 (R. 72). At the conclusion of the State's case, the Petitioner took the stand and indicated his desire to plead guilty (R. 207 - 208). The Petitioner then in the presence of the jury admitted his part in the robbery-homicide (R. 218 - 221).

On April 27, 1977 the Court held a post-trial hearing to determine whether the Petitioner would be sentenced to death or sentenced to life imprisonment without parole (R. 229 - 237). The State offered evidence at the hearing of Petitioner's prior convictions through F. B. I. records and Petitioner's sworn testimony (R. 229-234). The Court gave the Petitioner and his attorney an opportunity to present in mitigation any evidence concerning the Petitioner (R. 235 - 237). After conducting the sentencing hearing the trial court made a written finding as to each of the aggravating and mitigating factors under Alabama's capital punishment statute. Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-6 and 13-11-7 (R. 243 - 246). The trial court found as a further mitigating factor that Mr. Ritter made no attempt to harm the two young daughters of the victim (R. 246). The Court then

sentenced the Petitioner to death noting that the aggravating circumstances outweighed the mitigating circumstances (R. 246-247).

Petitioner was afforded automatic review of his conviction and sentence in an appeal to the Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals. On October 25, 1977 the Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals affirmed the conviction and sentence imposed on Petitioner. Evans v. State, 361 So. 2d 654 (Ala. Cr. App. 1977). The Court of Criminal Appeals denied Petitioner's application for rehearing on November 15, 1977.

On November 29, 1977 Petitioner filed a petition for writ of certiorari with the Alabama Supreme Court. On December 8, 1977 the Alabama Supreme Court granted the writ. On May 19, 1978 the Alabama Supreme Court reversed and remanded the decision of the Court of Criminal Appeals with respect to Wayne Ritter for the Court of Criminal Appeals to consider the applicability of the "felony-murder doctrine."

On August 9, 1978 the Court of Criminal Appeals again affirmed the conviction and sentence imposed on the Petitioner. Rehearing was denied on August 28, 1978. On July 6, 1979 the Alabama Supreme Court affirmed the conviction and sentence of Wayne Ritter. Rehearing was denied on September 7, 1979.

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS

The events and circumstances involving the robbery and killing of Edward A. Nassar are set out in the opinion of the Court of Criminal Appeals. Evans v. State, 361 So. 2d 654, 655-661 (Ala. Cr. App. 1977). Those events are briefly summarized below.

On January 5, 1977 the Petitioner, Wayne Eugene Ritter, and John Louis Evans drove to Mobile, Alabama from Biloxi, Mississippi (R. 193, 324). They were low on money and were looking for a place to rob (R. 218). They also decided that while they were pulling a robbery they might as well get some guns (R. 218). Once in Mobile they drove around looking for a place to rob (R. 193, 218). They decided upon a pawnshop near Interstate 65 (R. 193, 218). Mrs. Jimmie Tagert identified Wayne Ritter as being one of two men she saw enter Edward Nassar's pawnshop on January 5, 1979 (R. 133).

Once in the store Wayne Ritter asked the clerk, Edward Nassar, to let him see a pistol which Nassar handed him (R. 194, 218). Ritter had some ammunition in his hand and he started loading the pistol (R. 194, 218). While Ritter was doing this, Evans had drawn his pistol (R. 194, 218).

Edward Nassar immediately dropped down behind the counter and started towards his office (R. 194, 219). At this point Nassar was shot by Evans (R. 194, 211, 219). Evans and Ritter had discussed the possibility of having to kill somebody during a robbery and Ritter was standing by to assist Evans in case he missed (R. 220, 221).

Evans and Ritter then left the store, with Ritter still clutching the pistol taken from Nassar (R. 219). John Dueitt made an in court identification of Wayne Ritter as being one of the men he saw leaving Edward Nassar's pawnshop on January 5, 1977 (R. 111). Evans and Ritter remained in Mobile until it was dark and then headed back to Biloxi, Mississippi (R. 194, 219).

Wayne Ritter was arrested by F. B. I. agents in Little Rock, Arkansas on March 7, 1977 (R. 156, 159). Ritter was returned to Mobile where he gave a statement to Sergeant John Phillips of the Mobile Police Department admitting his part in the robbery and murder of Edward Nassar (R. 190 - 194). Wayne Ritter again admitted his part in the robbery and murder of Edward Nassar in testimony at his trial (R. 216 - 221). The Defendants presented no evidence at trial other than their testimony admitting that they robbed and shot to death Edward A. Nassar (R. 210-221).

REASONS WHY THE WRIT SHOULD BE DENIED

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Even if this Court should hold in the Beck case that the preclusion of lesser included non-capital cases is unconstitutional when the evidence in a capital case would support a conviction on such offenses, that decision will not be dispositive of this case. Unlike the Beck case and most other capital cases, there was no evidentiary basis whatsoever for any lesser included offense instructions in this case. The federal rule and the general Alabama rule is that lesser included offenses should be submitted to the jury only when there is a reasonable basis in the evidence upon which a jury could rationally convict of a lesser instead of a greater offense. Such an evidentiary basis exists only if there is a factual dispute about an element essential to the

greater but not lesser offense. Not only was there no such dispute in this case, but every element of the greater offense was admitted and confessed, and there was a valid guilty plea to the greater offense.

The Constitution does not require that lesser included non-caiptal offenses be submitted to a jury in a capital case in which there is no evidentiary basis for them. Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U. S. 153, 160, 161, n. 2, 163, 215-216 (1976), upheld a capital punishment statute under which a trial judge is required to charge lesser included non-capital offenses only when they are supported by the evidence. None of the arguments against precluding lesser included offenses which are supported by the evidence apply to the situation in which there is no evidentiary support for them. Permitting a capital case jury to convict for a lesser included non-capital offense which has no basis in the evidence would only serve to promote jury nullification and the kind of de facto jury discretion which leads to irrational, arbitrary, and capricious sentencing.

The requirement that a jury verdict form convicting a capital defendant "fix the punishment at death" serves to buttress the requirement of proof beyond a reasonable doubt at the guilt stage and does not lead to capriciousness in sentencing. The trial judge and not the jury is the sentencing authority. A capital defendant is sentenced only after a sentence hearing is held where the trial judge considers statutory aggravating and mitigating circumstances and any non-statutory mitigating circumstance relevant to the case. There is no presumption that death is the proper penalty, and the judge reaches the sentencing decision only after weighing the particular aggravating and mitigating circumstances in each individual case. Trial judges

can be trusted to perform their sentencing duties properly, and they have done so.

Capital sentences have been reviewed at the appellate level in two ways - by independent weighing of the aggravating and mitigating circumstances and by comparative review of the sentence with the sentences in other cases. In this case, the Court of Criminal Appeals weighed the aggravating and mitigating circumstances and found the sentence to be proper. This system of appellate review insures that death sentences are not "wantonly" or "freakishly" imposed.

Alabama's statute operates to effectively require proof beyond a reasonable doubt of at least one aggravating circumstance before a death sentence can be imposed. If more is required, Alabama's statute can be interpreted to provide it. In any event, all of the aggravating circumstances considered in this case were proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

The Petitioner knowingly and voluntarily waived any error in the trial courts charge to the jury in the instant case. It is clear that such a waiver of rights is permissible under the United States Constitution.

ARGUMENT

1. THE PRECLUSION OF LESSER INCLUDED OFFENSES WAS NOT UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN THIS PARTICULAR CASE BECAUSE THERE WAS NO EVIDENTIARY BASIS FOR THEM

A. Introduction

The Petitioner argues that the preclusion of lesser included offense charges under Alabama's capital punishment

statute results in the facial invalidity of the statute. The question of whether a sentence of death may constitutionally be imposed after a jury verdict of guilt of a capital offense when the jury was not permitted to consider a verdict of guilt of a lesser included non-capital offense and when the evidence would have supported such a verdict is presently before this Court. Beck v. Alabama, 365 So. 2d 1006 (Ala. 1978), cert. granted, 26 Cr. L. 4052 (October 9, 1979).

The instant case is distinctly different from the Beck case, supra, in that there was no evidence presented at the trial of Wayne Ritter which would have supported a conviction for a lesser included non-capital offense. It is the position of the State that even if this Court should decide in Beck that it is unconstitutional to preclude a lesser included non-capital offense in a capital case in which there is a factual basis in the evidence for a conviction for that lesser offense, it is not unconstitutional to preclude a conviction for a lesser included offense when as in the instant case there is no evidence presented at the trial of the capital case which would support a conviction for the lesser offense instead of for the capital offense.

B. The Rule in Non-Capital Cases is That a Jury is Permitted to Consider Lesser Included Offenses Only if There is a Factual Basis in the Evidence for Them

(1) The Federal Rule

As this Court held in Sansome v. United States, 380 U. S. 343, 350 (1965), "A lesser included offense instruction is only proper where the charged greater offense required the jury to

find a disputed factual element which is not required for conviction of the lesser included offense." Accord, e. g., United States v. Madden, 525 F. 2d 972, 973 (5th Cir. 1976); United States v. Flint, 534 F. 2d 58, 60 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 429 U. S. 924 (1976). It is neither necessary nor proper to permit a jury to consider convicting a defendant for a lesser offense unless the jury could rationally find that although all the elements of the higher offense had not been proven all of the elements of the lesser offense had been. E. g., Sansome v. United States, 380 U. S. at 351; Methvin v. United States, 441 F. 2d 584, 586 (5th Cir. 1971), cert. denied, 404 U. S. 839. The case of Keeble v. United States, 412 U. S. 205 (1973), is not to the contrary, because in that case the defendant's intent to create serious bodily harm was "very much in dispute at trial." 412 U. S. at 213. Since that intent was an element of the higher offense but not of the lesser offense, the Court specifically found that the jury "could rationally" have convicted the defendant of the lesser offense instead of the greater one. 412 U. S. at 213. Absent a factual dispute over the existence of an element necessary only to the higher offense, the result is to the contrary. As the Court said in Sansome v. United States, 380 U. S. at 354-355:

> In sum, it is clear here that there was no disputed issues of fact which would justify instructing the jury that it could find that petitioner had committed all the elements of either or both of the [lesser offenses] without having committed a violation of the [higher offense]. This being the case, the petitioner was not entitled to a lesser included offense charge. . . .

The rule described is the rule which prevails in the federal courts, but the same rule generally applies in Alabama courts.

(2) The Rule in Alabama

Under Alabama law, the general rule is that a defendant is not entitled to have the jury consider a lesser included offense unless under a reasonable theory based upon the evidence the defendant could be guilty of the lesser offense instead of the greater one. E. g., Fulgham v. State, 291 Ala. 71, 277 So. 2d 886, 890 (1973) (upholding refusal to instruct on manslaughter in the second degree in a murder case); Kelly v. State, 235 Ala. 5, 176 So. 807, 808 (1937) (upholding refusal to instruct on larceny and assault and battery in a robbery case); Whitehead v. State, 206 Ala. 288, 90 So. 351, 354 (1921) (upholding refusal to instruct on manslaughter in the first degree in a murder case); Golston v. State, 57 Ala. App. 623, 330 So. 2d 446, 449-450 (1975) (upholding refusal to instruct on attempted robbery in a robbery case); Harvest v. State, 342 So. 2d 1369, 1372 (Ala. Cr. App. 1977) (upholding refusal to instruct on petty larceny in a grand larceny case); Harris v. State. 44 Ala. App. 654, 219 So. 2d 410 413 (1969) (upholding refusal to instruct on grand larceny in a robbery case); Bowman v. State, 44 Ala. App. 331, 208 So. 241, 244-245 (1968) (upholding refusal to instruct on lesser included offenses in a robbery case). These cases also establish that where evidence is undisputed, there can be no evidentiary basis

for permitting the jury to consider any lesser included offenses. See, e. g., Harris v. State, 219 So. 2d at 413; Golston v. State, supra.[1]

There is one and only one exception to the rule in Alabama that lesser included offenses are to be submitted to the jury only if there is an evidentiary basis to support them. That exception is contained in Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-1-73 which provides that when a jury convicts a defendant under an indictment for murder in the first degree, the jury must be permitted to determine whether the defendant is guilty of murder in the first or second degree. This special statutory rule, which is an exception to the general rule, means that at the trial of a first degree murder indictment the jury must be instructed on and permitted to convict for second degree murder regardless of whether there is a factual basis in the evidence for that lesser included offense.[2] This special statutory rule applies only to murder indictments and not to capital indictments generally. For example, before Furman v. Georgia, 408 U. S. 238 (1972), robbery was a capital crime in Alabama, Title 14, § 415, Code of Alabama 1940 (Recompiled 1958), yet the Alabama courts repeatedly held that it was not proper to permit a jury to consider lesser included offenses in a robbery case unless there was some evidentiary basis for convicting on them instead of on robbery itself. E. g., Kelly v. State, 235 Ala. 5, 176 So. 807, 808 (1937); Bowman v. State, 44 Ala. App. 331, 208 So. 2d 241, 244-245 (1968).

---

[1]This case law has been codified in Code of Alabama 1975, § 13A-1-9(b) (1979 Supp.) which provides that, "The court shall not charge the jury with respect to an included offense unless there is a rational basis for a verdict convicting the defendant of the included offense." Section 13A-1-9(b) is part of the new Alabama Criminal Code, adopted in 1977, but applicable only to crimes committed on or after January 1, 1980.

[2]Effective January 1, 1980, Section 13-1-73 is repealed and replaced by Section 13A-1-9(b) of the new Alabama Criminal Code. See n. 1, above.

Even if the clause in Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-2(a), which precluded lesser included offenses in capital cases were to be held unconstitutional and severed from the statute, there would still be no state law requirement that the jury in a capital case be permitted to consider lesser included offenses for which there is no basis in the evidence. Section 13-1-73 would not apply, because that statutory provision is limited by its terms to murder indictments. The Alabama Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the capital felonies which are listed in Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-2(a) are not crimes of murder and cannot be described or referred to as murder, or capital murder, or even murder under aggravated circumstances. E. g., Clements v. State, 370 So. 2d 723 (Ala. 1979); Watters v. State, 369 So. 2d 1272 (Ala. 1979); Jacobs (John L.) v. State, 371 So. 2d 448 (Ala. 1979). Therefore it follows that if the preclusion of lesser included offenses clause contained in Alabama's capital punishment statute is held to be unconstitutional and is severed from the statute, then the law in Alabama will be that a jury in a capital case is to be in instructed on and permitted to find lesser included non-capital offenses when and only when the evidence provides a factual basis which would support a conviction on the lesser offense instead of on the capital offense.[3]

---

[3]If the preclusion of lesser included offenses raised by the evidence is held unconstitutional in Beck v. Alabama, supra, then the question of the severability of the preclusion clause of section 13-11-2(a) will be an issue of Alabama law. E. g., Morey v. Doud, 354 U. S. 457, 470, n. 16 (1957). Of course, whether the United States Constitution requires that a jury in a capital case be allowed to convict on lesser included offenses even if they are not supported by the evidence is a federal issue. That issue is discussed at pp. 12 - 16 of this brief, below.

Therefore, neither Alabama law nor general federal law requires that a jury be permitted to convict on a lesser included offense if there is no factual dispute in the evidence upon which such a conviction can be based. Nor does federal constitutional law require it.

C. The Constitution Does Not Require That a Jury in a Capital Case be Permitted to Consider Non-Capital Lesser Included Offenses for Which There is No Basis in the Evidence

There is a significant difference between preventing a jury in a capital case from considering a lesser included offense supported by the evidence and preventing it from considering a lesser included offence which has no basis in the evidence. That difference was recognized by this Court when it limited its grant of certiorari in Beck v. Alabama, supra, to the constitutionality of not permitting a jury to consider a verdict of guilty on a lesser included non-capital offense "when the evidence would have supported such a verdict."

Under the Georgia capital punishment statute upheld in Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U. S. 153, 163 (1976) "the trial judge is required to charge lesser included offenses when they are supported by any view of the evidence." However, the Georgia statute does not require that lesser included offenses be submitted to the jury if they are not supported "by any view of the evidence." The Gregg case is itself an example. Gregg was charged with murder during the course of a robbery. The trial court charged the jury on felony murder, non-felony murder, and on the lesser included offenses of robbery, but it specifically refused to charge on the lesser included offense of manslaughter. 428 U. S. at 160, 215 - 216. This

Court expressly noted that the Georgia Supreme Court had upheld the trial court's refusal to instruct the jury on voluntary manslaughter, "since there was no evidence to support that verdict." 428 U. S. at 161, n. 2 (opinion of Stewart, Powell, and Stevens, J. J. — hereinafter referred to as "joint opinion"). This Court upheld the Georgia statute and affirmed the judgment of the Georgia Supreme Court. Therefore, Gregg v. Georgia, supra, establishes that it is not unconstitutional in a capital case to prevent a jury from considering lesser included non-capital offenses when there is no evidentiary basis for them.

The Louisiana statute struck down in Roberts (Stanislaus) v. Louisiana, 428 U. S. 325, 330 (1976), provided that capital juries must be instructed on the non-capital lesser included offenses of second degree murder and manslaughter "whether or not raised by the evidence." While this was not the reason the statute was held unconstitutional, 428 U. S. at 336, the Roberts plurality did note that such a requirement "plainly invites the jurors to disregard their oaths and choose a verdict for a lesser offense whenever they feel the death penalty is inappropriate," thereby injecting "an element of capriciousness" and permitting the "arbitrary exercise of the capital jury's de facto sentencing discretion." 428 U. S. at 335 (joint opinion). While the quoted words were spoken in a case involving a mandatory statute, the same concerns exist in regard to the operation of non-mandatory statutes.

This Court has indicated that in order to comply with Furman, capital punishment procedures should not create "a substantial risk that the death penalty would be inflicted in

an arbitrary and capricious manner." Lockett v. Ohio, 438 U. S. 586, 601 (1978) (plurality opinion). Furman requires that sentencing discretion be "directed and limited" so that the death penalty will be imposed in a more "consistent and rational manner" and so that there will be a meaningful basis for distinguishing the cases in which it is imposed from the cases in which it is not imposed. Lockett v. Ohio, supra. Permitting the jury in a capital case to convict for a lesser included non-capital offense which has no basis in the evidence will only serve to promote jury nullification and the kind of de facto sentencing discretion which will cause the death penalty to be inflicted in an arbitrary and capricious manner. Instructing a jury to apply the law and decide the case on the basis of the evidence and then giving them a tool which serves no purpose other than to permit them to disregard the law and evidence is illogical. It does not promote consistent and rational sentencing, but just the opposite. A verdict convicting a defendant of a lesser included offense for which there is no factual basis in the evidence can only be based on caprice or emotion rather than reason. A defendant is not constitutionally entitled to that.

On pages 7 - 9 of Ritter's brief, he argues that the preclusion of lesser included offenses denigrates the proof beyond the reasonable doubts standard by encouraging jurors to convict in spite of it. This argument is explicitly premised upon there being at the trial proof beyond a reasonable doubt of a lesser included offense but not of the capital offense itself. That situation, by definition, does not exist in a case like the present one where there is no factual basis for

a jury to find that the defendant was guilty of a lesser offense but not of the greater capital offense. Nor does Keeble v. United States, 412 U. S. 205 (1973), support a contrary conclusion. As was discussed on p. 8 of this brief, above, in Keeble there was a factual dispute which provided an evidentiary basis for the lesser included offense, and that basis was specifically recognized by this Court.

Likewise, the equal protection analysis on pp. 9 - 10 of Ritter's brief yields an entirely different result when applied to the preclusion of lesser included offenses not supported by the evidence. Not permitting a jury to convict on lesser included offenses not supported by the evidence is the general rule in Alabama and in the federal courts. See pp. 7-12 of this brief, above. It is true that, until January 1, 1980, Alabama has in effect a special statute requiring that regardless of the evidence juries be instructed on second degree murder in the trial of all non-capital first degree murder indictments. See p. 10 of this brief, above. The difference between this rule and the refusal to instruct on lesser included offenses not supported by the evidence in this and other capital cases is justified by the compelling state interest in avoiding jury nullification and promoting consistent, rational and non-arbitrary jury sentencing in capital cases. See pp. 13-14 of this brief, above.

Ritter's Eighth Amendment argument is based upon the "uniqueness" of Alabama's preclusion of factually supported lesser included offenses. The rule precluding jury consideration of lesser included offenses not supported by the evidence is not unique. That is the general rule in non-capital cases in this country, and it is the rule in federal courts. Ritter has not

cited any authority which establishes a different rule in capital cases, and Gregg v. Georgia, supra, is authority to the contrary. See pp. 12-13 of this brief, above.

D. There was no Factual Basis in the Evidence at Ritter's Trial to Support a Conviction on a Lesser Included Non-Capital Offense

(1) The Non-Capital Lesser Offenses Included in the Crime for Which Ritter Was Charged

Under Alabama law, every killing is unlawful unless expressly excused or justified by law. Knight v. State, 50 Ala. App. 39, 276 So. 2d 624 (1973). Every unlawful killing constitutes either a capital crime, first degree murder, second degree murder, first degree manslaughter, or second degree manslaughter.[4] The capital crimes are defined in Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-2(a).

Ritter was convicted of the capital felony defined in § 13-11-2(a)(2) which is defined as "Robbery or attempts thereof when the victim is intentionally killed by the defendant." While the state could have averred and proved simply that during the robbery Ritter intentionally killed Nassar, it gratuitously averred that during the robbery Ritter committed murder in the first degree of Nassar.[5]

---

[4]Effective January 1, 1980, a new Alabama Criminal Code will go into effect. Code of Alabama 1975, § 13A-1-1 through § 13A-14-5 (1979 Supp.). This new code abolishes the degree of murder and manslaughter and changes the definition of the crimes. Sections 13A-6-3. It also redefines the crime of robbery and divides it into three degrees. Sections 13A-8-41 through 13A-8-43. However, none of the provisions of this new criminal code apply to any crime committed prior to January 1, 1980. Section 13A-1-7. Accordingly, the discussion of lesser included offenses in this brief will be based upon the law applicable to Ritter.

[5]First degree murder is averred in an indictment in Alabama by use of the words, "unlawfully, and with malice aforethought, killed." Code of Alabama 1975, § 15-8-150(72).

In spite of the fact that the statute does not require such an extra averment, many of the capital cases which have reached Alabama's appellate courts have included it, apparently because prosecutors were unsure that a mere averment of intentional killing would suffice. The Alabama Supreme Court has held that while such a practice is not required, it is permitted, but if the indictment avers first degree murder instead of simply an intentional killing then first degree murder must be proven. E. g., Clements v. State, 370 So. 2d 723, 725 (Ala. 1979); Jacobs (John L.) v. State, 371 So. 2d 448, 449 (Ala. 1979).

Accordingly, in Ritter's case there were two elements of his capital crime — robbery and first degree murder of the victim. There are four types or classes of first degree murder in Alabama, and they are defined in Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-1-70. Ritter was charged and convicted, as part of the capital crime, with the first type of first degree murder which is, "any . . . kind of willful, deliberate, malicious and premeditated killing." The willful, deliberate, and premeditated aspects are self-explanatory. Malice must also be present. In Alabama homicide law, malice does not mean hate or ill will, but instead described the mental state or condition which prompts the taking of another's life without legal excuse or justification. E. g., Lowery v. State, 294 Ala. 347, 317 So. 2d 360 (1975); McGuffin v. State, 178 Ala. 40, 59 So. 635 (1912). Unless the circumstances of the killing rebut it, malice is presumed from the use of a deadly weapon such as a pistol. E. g., Smith v. State, 53 Ala. App. 141, 298 So. 2d 71 (1974); Hackman v. State, 41 Ala. App. 642, 644, 148 So. 2d 253 (1962) described as "a long prevailing presumption in the criminal jurisprudence of Alabama").

Murder in the second degree is the unlawful killing of a human being with malice but without premeditation or deliberation. E. g., Miller v. State, 40 So. 47 (Ala. 1906); Cooper v. State, 364 So. 2d 382, 387 (Ala. Cr. App.), cert, denied 364 So. 2d 388 (Ala. 1978). The difference between first degree murder and second degree murder is thus the element of premeditation or deliberation.

Manslaughter in the first degree is the unlawful killing of a human being without premeditation or deliberation and without malice. Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-1-90; Martin v. State, 56 Ala. App. 33, 318 So. 2d 772, cert. denied, 294 Ala. 765, 318 So. 2d 775 (1975); Wilkinson v. State, 50 Ala. App. 150, 277 So. 2d 423, cert. denied, 291 Ala. 802, 277 So. 2d 427 (1973). Thus, the difference between second degree murder and first degree manslaughter is the element of malice. E. g., Hunter v. State, 335 So. 2d 194, 200 (Ala. Cr. App.), cert. denied, 335 So. 2d 203 (Ala. 1976); Morris v. State, 47 Ala. App. 132, 251 So. 2d 629, 633 (1971).

Manslaughter in the second degree, a misdemeanor, is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice and without intent to kill, which killing is committed accidently in the commission of an unlawful act not felonious, or accidently in the improper or negligent performance of a lawful act. E. g., Johnson v. State, 94 Ala. 35, 41, 10 So. 667 (1891); Callahan v. State, 343 So. 2d 551, 554 (Ala. Cr. App. 1977).

Robbery is defined as the felonious taking of money or goods of value from the person of another or in his presence by violence or by putting him in fear. E. g., Golston v. State, 57 Ala. App. 623, 330 So. 2d 446, 450 (1975). Its essential

elements are felonious intent, force or putting in fear as the means of effecting the intent, and by that means, taking and carrying away the property of another from his person or presence. Golston v. State, 330 So. 2d at 450. Robbery includes the lesser offenses of larceny, assault, assault and battery, and attempted robbery. Golston v. State, 330 So. 2d at 449.

(2) The Evidence

The evidence against Ritter is summarized on pp. 2-4 of this brief, above. The evidence establishing each element of the capital offense was a overwhelming as any evidence could ever be. Not only did Ritter confess to the F. B. I., to the Mobile Police Department, and to the grand jury that he had robbed and murdered Edward Nassar, he also took the stand and confessed his participation in the crime. In Ritter's own words "Well, I think there are two considerations. First, we did kill Mr. Nassar. We knew we might have to kill somebody during any robbery. We had discussed it before. If anybody went for a gun, that's what was going to happen. We did kill him, so, really, the only thing you can come back with is the death penalty." (R. 220).

All of the elements of first degree murder and robbery were undisputed. They were established by the state's independent evidence and by Ritter's own confessions and admissions both before trial and during the trial. If any more could conceivably be needed, it is furnished by Ritter's guilty plea. At arraignment, against the advice of his attorneys, Ritter pleaded guilty to the capital offense (R. 55 - 62).

In Alabama, when a capital defendant pleads guilty a jury trial is still required. Prothro v. State, 370 So. 2d 740 (Ala. Cr. App. 1979). Accordingly, in spite of Ritter's guilty plea, he was still tried. At the trial, a copy of his written "Motion to Enter Guilty Plea" was introduced into evidence (R. 207-208, 252, 283-284). The guilty plea was voluntary, and the trial court accepted the guilty plea but made the state put on its case anyway.

In the words of the Alabama Supreme Court in Fulgham v. State, 291 Ala. 71, 277 So. 2d 886, 890 (1973), there was no reasonable theory based upon the evidence under which Ritter could be guilty of a lesser included non-capital offense instead of the capital offense. In the words of Sansome v. United States, 380 U. S. 343, 350-351 (1965), no lesser included offense instruction was proper because the jury was not required to find a disputed factual element required for conviction of the higher offense but not for conviction of a lower offense. There were no disputed factual elements at all. Not only did the evidence establish without dispute all of the elements of the capital offense but Ritter also admitted, confessed, and pleaded guilty to them. In the absence of any disputed issue of fact, the jury could not rationally find Ritter guilty of a lesser included non-capital offense instead of the capital offense itself. Sansome, v. United States, 380 U. S. at 351. Finally, in the words used by the Supreme Court in Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U. S. 153, 161, n. 2 (1976) (joint opinion), the trial court was not required to permit the jury to return a verdict of guilty on a lesser included non-capital offense, "since there was no evidence to support that verdict."

E. Ritter has No Standing to Attack the Validity of the Preclusion of Jury Consideration of Lesser Included Offenses Under Alabama's Capital Punishment Statute

Because Ritter was not constitutionally entitled to any lesser included offense instruction in view of the evidence at his trial, the failure to give such an instruction was not a violation of his constitutional rights. While Ritter purports to attack the facial validity of Alabama's statute, he cites no cases which establish that he may challenge the validity of a statute on the ground that it may conceivably be applied unconstitutionally to others, in other situations. Broadrick v. Oklahoma, 413 U. S. 601, 610 (1973). In Broadrick this Court specifically stated that except in First Amendment areas, "a person to whom a statute may constitutionally be applied will not be heard to challenge that statute on the ground that it may conceivably be applied unconstitutionally to others, in other situations not before the Court." And in Dobbert v. Florida, 432 U. S. 282, 300, 301 (1977) where the petitioner was attacking the constitutionality, under the ex post facto clause of the Constitution, of the imposition of the death penalty under Florida statutes in effect at the time of the petitioner's trial, when the killing occurred at a time when the death penalty was governed by earlier Florida statutes, this Court held, "that petitioner having been sentenced to death, may not complain of burdens attached to the life sentence under the new law which may not have attached to it under the old."

If it were not for the statutory provision in Section 13-11-2(a) precluding the consideration of lesser included non-capital offenses, a jury would be permitted to consider

such lesser offenses only when there was an evidentiary basis for them. See pp. 9-12 of this brief, above. Therefore, the purpose and effect of the statutory provision is to preclude consideration of lesser included non-capital offenses when there is an evidentiary basis for such offenses. Since there was no evidentiary basis for them in Ritter's case, the statutory provision did not make any difference, and therefore it could not have prejudged his constitutional rights in any way. Because its mere existence in the abstract affected neither his trial nor his sentence, he has no standing to challenge its validity.

II. THE ALABAMA SENTENCING PROCEDURE AT THE TRIAL COURT LEVEL IS CONSTITUTIONAL

A. An Overview of the Sentencing Process

Under Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-2(a) and (c) the jury trying a capital case has three alternatives: 1) it can acquit the denfendant of the capital crime with which he is charged; 2) it can convict the defendant of the capital crime with a verdict form which "fix[es] the punishment at death,"; or, 3) it can fail to agree "on a verdict of guilty or not guilty or on the fixing of the penalty of death." If the jury acquits the defendant, he is discharged. If the jury convicts the defendant and "fix[es]" his punishment at death, the trial court judge then holds a sentence hearing to determine whether the defendant will be sentenced to death or to life without parole. Sections 13-11-3 and 13-11-4. If the jury fails to agree on a verdict of guilty or not guilty or on "the fixing

of the penalty at death" in the verdict form, then a mistrial results. After a mistrial, the defendant can be tried again for the capital offense or he can be re-indicted and tried for a non-capital offense.

The jury is not the sentencing authority. Under § 13-11-4, the judge performs that function. As the Alabama Supreme Court noted in Jacobs v. State, 361 So. 2d 640, 644 (Ala. 1978), cert. denied, 439 S. Ct. 1122 (1979):

> Alabama's sentencing scheme is similar to that in Florida, in that a jury verdict is a necessary step in the scheme but the jury is not the sentencing authority in either Florida or Alabama.

Accord, Beck v. State, 365 So. 2d 985, 1001 (1978), aff'd, 365 So. 2d 1006 (Ala. 1978), cert. granted _____ U. S. _____.

Even though the jury is not the sentencing authority, the requirement that any guilty verdict it returns "fix the punishment at death" serves a very important function. In Gardner v. Florida, 430 U. S. 349, 357-358 (1977) (plurality opinion), Woodson v. North Carolina, 428 U. S. at 305 (plurality opinion), and Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U. S. at 187 (joint opinion), this Court recognized that for constitutional purposes death is a punishment unlike any other. Because of the profound difference between death and any other punishment, greater reliability is necessary. See Lockett v. Ohio, 438 U. S. 586, 604 (1978). In a capital case, a procedural device is constitutionally valuable if it helps to insure that jurors vote to convict only those defendants whose guilt the jurors are truly convinced of beyond any reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty.

The best way to insure that jurors are aware of their awesome task and its terrible responsibilities in determining guilt in a capital case is to confront them with it. That is what the statutory provision accomplishes when it requires the jury to phrase a guilty verdict in terms of the punishment of death, even though the jury is not the sentencing authority. Any capital sentencing system is which the jury is tempted to "pass the buck" to the judge runs the risk that guilt adjudication will not be as reliable as possible. Under Alabama's system, the jury is reminded that the "buck stops here" and it thereby has more reason to realize its awesome responsibility and to discharge it with care.

If the defendant is convicted by the jury, the sentencing process then begins. Under Section 13-11-3, the trial court judge holds a separate sentence hearing for the purpose of determining the appropriate punishment for that particular defendant in that specific case. The statute states that the purpose of this sentence hearing is, ". . . to aid the court to determine whether or not the court will sentence the defendant to death or to life imprisonment without parole." Id. The Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals in reversing and remanding a capital case for a new sentence hearing in Willie Lewis Mack v. State, 375 So. 2d 476, 500-501 (Ala. Cr. App. 1978), aff'd, 375 So. 2d 504 (Ala. 1979), described the sentence hearing required under Alabama's statute as follows:

> The sentencing hearing is one of the most important and critical stages under Alabama's death penalty law. The guilt stage has passed. Now an experienced trial judge must consider the particularized circumstances surrounding the offense and the offender and determine if the accused is to die or be sentenced to life imprisonment without parole. It is a due

> process hearing of the highest magnitude and the exclusionary rules of evidence play no part. The trial evidence must be reviewed to determine all of the aggravating circumstances leading up to and culminating in the death of the victim and then all the mitigating circumstances must be considered in determining if any outweigh the aggravating circumstances so found in the trial court's findings of fact. Unless and until this is done "the trial judge cannot fairly weigh the aggravating and mitigating circumstances, and the appellate court cannot adequately review his sentencing decision."

At the sentence hearing, the trial court judge weighs the aggravating and mitigating circumstances which are relevant to the case and the individual defendant before him. The statutory aggravating and mitigating circumstances are set out in Sections 13-11-6 and 13-11-7. With one minor difference, they are identical to the statutory aggravating and mitigating circumstances contained in the Florida statute which was upheld in Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U. S. at 248, n. 6 (1976). In addition, unlike the Ohio statute struck down in Lockett v. Ohio, 438 U. S. 586 (1978), the Alabama statute does not limit the trial judge's consideration of mitigating circumstances to those enumerated in the statute. Instead, Section 13-11-3 expressly provides that, "In the hearing evidence may be presented as to any matter that the court deems relevant to sentence . . . ." The Alabama appellate courts have repeatedly held that the statute provides for the consideration of non-statutory mitigating circumstances. E. g., Cooke v. State, 369 So. 2d 1251, 1256 (1979); Jacobs (Jerry Wayne) v. State,

361 So. 2d at 652-654 (1978). In the present case the trial court found, that the only statutory mitigating circumstance was Wayne Ritter's age. The trial court further found that a non-statutory mitigating circumstance existed. The Court found the following:

> (h) The Court finds further another mitigating circumstance, although not set out as such in Section 7 of said Act 213, to be the fact that Mr. Ritter made no effort or attempt to harm the two young daughters of Edward A. Nassar, deceased, who were in his immediate presence at the time of the commission of the Capital Felony or any of the other witnesses in the vicinity. (R. 246)

In the words of Lockett, 438 U. S. at 602, 604, the Alabama statute thus provides for "individualized sentencing" and the trial court judge as the sentencing authority is not "precluded from considering as a mitigating factor, any aspect of a defendant's character or record and any of the circumstances of the offense that the defendant proffers as a basis for a sentence less than death." (Emphasis in original, footnote omitted.)

As is discussed on pp. 35-45 of this brief, below, the sentencing process is not complete until after appeal, because the Alabama appellate courts have and exercise the authority to review sentencing decisions.

B. Alabama's Statute is Not Contrary to the Holdings of the Woodson and Roberts Cases

In Woodson v. North Carolina, 428 U. S. 280 (1976), Roberts (Stanislaus) v. Louisiana, 428 U. S. 325 (1976), and Roberts (Harry) v. Louisiana, 431 U. S. 633 (1977), the Court held that mandatory death penalty statutes were

unconstitutional. The reasons given were three. First, it was held that to impose the death penalty on every person convicted of a capital offense, or even a particular type of capital offense, was contrary to contemporary societal standards. Woodson v. North Carolina, 480 U. S. at 332-333 (plurality opinion). Alabama's statute does not rul afoul of this holding, because it does not impose the death penalty on every defendant convicted of a capital offense.

The second reason why the North Carolina and Louisiana statutes were struck down is because the plurality held that with mandatory statutes, there was a:

> failure to provide a constitutionally tolerable response to Furman's rejection of unbridled jury discretion in the imposition of capital sentences. Central to the limited holding in Furman was the conviction that the vesting of standardless sentencing power in the jury violated the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. . . . Woodson v. North Carolina, 428 U. S. at 302 (plurality opinion).

Mandatory statutes, according to the plurality, "have simply papered over the problem of unguided and unchecked jury discretion." 428 U. S. at 302. The problems of unguided and unchecked jury discretion were specified in the three concurring opinions which constituted the holding in Furman. In Furman, Mr. Justice White observed that under the pre-Furman statutes the death penalty had been imposed with "great infrequency" and that there was "no meaningful basis for distinguishing the few cases in which it [was] imposed from the many cases in which it [was] not." 408 U. S. at 313. Mr. Justice Douglas stated that the imposition of the death penalty had been "pregnant with discrimination." 408 U. S. at 257. Mr. Justice Stewart specified that the sentence

of death had been "wantonly" and "freakishly" imposed. 408 U. S. at 310. The problems which the Woodson plurality feared with mandatory statutes were jury nullification through refusals to convict and the exercise of de facto sentencing discretion through the exercise of the jury's power to convict on lesser included offenses. The plurality noted that, "American juries have persistently refused to convict a significant portion of persons charged with first degree murder of that offense under mandatory death penalty statutes." 428 U. S. at 302. It observed that refusals to convict of the capital offense had occurred, "quite frequently." 428 U. S. at 302. It also characterized the evidence of jury nullification as "impressive." 428 U. S. at 293, n. 29.

Because a jury which convicts a capital defendant under Alabama's statute is required to use a verdict form which "fix[es] the punishment at death," Ritter argues on p. 15 of his brief that "some Alabama juries may acquit guilty capital defendants they believe do not deserve to die." From this speculation, it is apparently supposed to follow that de facto sentencing discretion and jury nullification will lead to the kind of unconstitutionally capricious and arbitrary sentencing results which were noted in Furman, Woodson, and the Roberts cases.

De facto jury discretion exists when a jury can evade imposition of the death penalty on a defendant by the simple expedient of convicting him of a lesser included offense. Roberts (Stanislaus) v. Louisiana, 428 U. S. at 334-335. The North Carolina, the Louisiana, and the pre-Furman statutes

permitted the exercise of de facto jury discretion through conviction for lesser included offenses. Indeed, Louisiana's statute invited it by requiring that juries be instructed on lesser included offenses even when the evidence would not support such an instruction. Roberts (Stanislaus) v. Louisiana, 428 U. S. at 334-335. Alabama's statute neither invites nor permits de facto jury discretion, because it precludes lesser included offenses.

Jury nullification occurs when a jury acquits a guilty capital defendant because it does not think he deserves the death penalty. The offenses made punishable by death under Alabama's statute are very narrowly defined to include only the most serious crimes committed by the most dangerous criminals. Before a guilty capital defendant can be acquitted through jury nullification under Alabama's statute, twelve jurors who believe beyond a reasonable doubt that he was a dangerous criminal who had committed a very serious crime would have to unanimously agree to acquit him merely because they disagreed with the death penalty. There is no evidence that frequent jury nullification has occurred under the operation of Alabama's statute. Certainly, there is no "impressive" evidence of frequent jury nullification like that relied upon in Woodson. Nor is there any real prospect that such jury nullification will occur in the future.

C. Jury Input Into the Sentencing Decision is Not Constitutionally Required

On p. 16 of his brief, Ritter argues that the Constitution mandates that a jury have significant input into

the sentencing decision in capital cases. No authority supports that proposition. In Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U. S. 242, 252 (1976) (opinion of Stewart, Powell, and Stevens, J. J. — hereinafter referred to as "joint opinion"), it was noted that:

> The basic difference between the Florida system and the Georgia system is that in Florida the sentence is determined by the trial judge rather than by the jury. This Court has pointed out that jury sentencing in a capital case can perform an important societal function, Witherspoon v. Illinois, 391 U. S. 510, 519 n. 15, 88 S. Ct. 1770, 20 L. Ed. 2d 776 (1968), but it has never suggested that jury sentencing is constitutionally required. And it would appear that judicial sentencing should lead, if anything, to even greater consistency in the imposition at the trial court level of capital punishment, since a trial judge is more experienced in sentencing than a jury, and therefore is better able to impose sentences similar to those imposed in analogous cases. (Emphasis added.)

Accord, Lockett v. Ohio, 438 U. S. at 633 (dissenting opinion of Rehnquist, J.); Richmond v. Arizona, 434 U. S. 1323 (1977) (opinion of Rehnquist, J., as Circuit Justice); see also, Beck v. State, 365 So. 2d at 1001. Therefore, four Justices of the Supreme Court have expressed their opinion that jury sentencing is not constitutionally required in capital cases. No member of this Court has ever suggested to the contrary. See also, State v. Simants, 197 Neb. 549, 250 N. W. 2d 881, 887 (Neb. 1977), where the Nebraska Supreme Court upheld that State's capital punishment statute against the contention that it was unconstitutional because of "the lack of jury involvement in the sentencing procedure."

Witherspoon v. Illinois, 391 U. S. 510 (1968), does not require jury input into sentencing in capital cases. Instead, the Witherspoon decision requires that selection of

the sentencing authority in a capital case be impartial and not biased to exclude those who have scruples against capital punishment. Applied to the sentencing procedure used under the Alabama statute, the Witherspoon decision means that the state cannot confine the responsibility for sentencing decisions in capital cases to only those trial court judges who personally favor capital punishment. Of course, the Alabama statute makes no effort to do that, and it therefore does not run afoul of Witherspoon. Any language in Witherspoon even arguably implying jury input should be read in the context of the pre-Furman era of which it was a part. Since that language was spoken, Furman and the post-Furman cases have recognized and emphasized the constitutional importance of consistency in capital sentencing, and the jury sentencing undermines that consistency.

The Proffitt joint opinion noted, 428 U. S. at 252, "that judicial sentencing should lead, if anything, to even greater consistency in the imposition at the trial court level of capital punishment, since a trial judge is more experienced in sentencing than a jury. . . ." While recognizing that problem inherent in jury sentencing might be alleviated to some extent by certain procedural adjustments, the same three Justices noted in Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U. S. at 192, that:

> Since the members of a jury will have had little, if any, previous experience in sentencing, they are unlikely to be skilled in dealing with the information they are given. See American Bar Association Project on Standards for Criminal Justice Sentencing Alternative and Procedures. §1.1(b), Commentary, pp. 46-47 (approved Draft 1968); President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice: The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, Task Force Report: the Courts 26 (1967). To the extent that this problem is inderent in jury sentencing, it may not be totally correctable. . . .

Four other justices recognized that even with the particular jury sentencing scheme approved in Gregg, there is still a danger of freakish and infrequent imposition of capital punishment, the very thing condemned in Furman. See, Roberts (Stanislaus) v. Louisiana, 428 U. S. 325 (1976) (dissenting opinion by White, Jr. joined by Burger, C. J., Blackmun, J., J. and Rehnquist, J.). Jury sentencing also endangers the value of appellate review of sentencing decisions, which was thought so constitutionally noteworthy in Gregg and Proffitt. Woodson v. North Carolina, 428 U. S. at 318 (dissenting opinion of Rhenquist, Jr.). Therefore, seven Justices have explicitly recognized the problems which jury sentencing in capital cases pose for the constitutionally valuable goal of even-handed and consistent sentences.

At the very least, the choice between jury sentencing and judicial sentencing in capital cases is one of those types of decisions which are properly within the province of legislative bodies. See, Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U. S. at 174-176 (1976) (joint opinion); Roberts (Stanislaus) v. Louisiana, 428 U. S. at 355-357, 363 (dissenting opinion of White, Jr., joined by Burger, C. J., Blackmun, J., and Rehnquist, J.).

D. The Sentencing Procedure Under Alabama's Statute is Reliable

On pp. 17 - 20 of Ritter's brief, he argues that the sentencing procedure under Alabama's statute is constitutionally unreliable because the trial judge holds a sentence hearing and makes the sentencing determination only after the jury has returned a verdict of guilty which "fixes the punishment at

death." The function of that jury verdict form is discussed on pp. 22 - 24 of this brief, above, and the sentencing procedure under Alabama's statute is discussed on pp. 22 - 26 of this brief, above. The judge and not the jury is the sentencing authority. There is no presumption in favor of a sentence of death, and the judge arrives at his sentencing decision only after a full, fair, and complete hearing into the aggravating and mitigating circumstances applicable to the particular defendant before him. In spite of all this, Ritter argues, in effect, that trial court judges cannot be trusted to exercise their sentencing function properly because to impose a sentence of life without parole instead of death puts a judge "in a publicly unfavorable light."

Ritter relies heavily on a passage from the dissenting opinion of Justice Jones in Jacobs (Jerry Wayne) v. State, 361 So. 2d at 650. Three things should be noted about those comments of Justice Jones. First, his comments were based on the public "outcry" that resulted from the sentence of life imprisoment without parole which was imposed in the case of Tony Randolph Nolen v. State, ___ So. 2d _____ (Ala. Cr. App. 1979). Justice Jones himself was careful to note that he was not "speaking to the merits of the case, or the propriety of the trial judge's action in the particular setting." 361 So. 2d at 650, n. 3. Indeed, he wasn't. When the Court of Criminal Appeals reviewed the "merits" of the Nolen case on appeal, it was forced to note that, "The criminal act for which the defendant was convicted is a horrifying and discouraging comment on the degree of inhumanity to which some men sink." Tony Randolph Nolen v. State, supra, Ms. Op. at 5. Even though Alabama's appellate courts have no power to increase

a sentence of life without parole to death, the sentencing decision made by the trial judge in the Nolen case was so questionable that one appellate judge on reviewing the case felt compelled to comment, "This was a dastardly act and the appellant should have been sentenced to die for the offense." Ms. Op. at 6 (special concurring opinion of DeCarlo, J.). Since the merits of the sentencing decision in the Nolen case caused an "outcry" at the appellate court level, there is no wonder that the same case caused a similar reaction by the public. The Constitution does not require that judges be immune from criticism, either from the public or from other judges, when they make a bad decision in either a capital or a non-capital case.

The second thing to note about Justice Jones' comments in Jacobs, upon which Ritter places so much reliance, is that those comments were answered by the majority on rehearing in that case. See, 361 So. 2d at 654.

The third thing to note about Justice Jones' comments is that the actual operation of Alabama's statute has not borne out his expectations. As of May 14, 1979, there had been nine (9) separate cases in which a defendant was sentenced to life without parole after having been convicted by a jury following a plea of not guilty. [6]

The fundamental assumption of Ritter's argument is that trial court judges cannot be trusted to properly perform their sentencing function. That assumption is closely akin to the

---

[6] In addition, there had been thirteen (13) other cases in which a defendant had received a sentence of life without parole as a result of a guilty plea and recommendation from the district attorney. Of course, district attorneys are much more likely to plea bargain and recommend life without parole in cases which are less deserving of the death penalty.

argument that prosecutors cannot be expected to exercise their prosecutorial and plea bargaining powers in a responsible manner. That argument has been rejected by six Justices of this Court no fewer than three times each. See, Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U. S. at 199 (joint opinion); Id. at 224-225 (concurring opinion of White, J., joined by Burger, C. J. and Rhenquist, J.); Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U. S. at 254 (joint opinion); Id. at 261 (concurring opinion of White, J., joined by Burger, C. J., and Rehnquist, J.). Jurek v. Texas, 428 U. S. at 274 (opinion of Stewart, Powell, and Stevens, J. J.); Id. at 278-279 (concurring opinion of White, J., joined by Burger, C. J., and Rehnquist, J.). Judges should not be considered less trustworthy or less responsible than prosecutors.

Finally, Ritter's argument ignores the appellate review of capital sentencing decisions which exists in Alabama.

III. ALABAMA DOES PROVIDE APPELLATE REVIEW OF CAPITAL SENTENCES

Ritter's argument that Alabama's statute does not provide for appellate review of sentencing decisions misses the mark for two reasons. First, it ignores § 13-11-5 which clearly states:

> The judgment of conviction and sentence of death shall be subject to automatic review as now required by law (Emphasis added.)

Secondly, there is no constitutional requirement that appellate review of sentencing decisions be authorized by statutory as opposed to case law. As Ritter himself notes in footnote 20 on p. 22 of his brief, the Florida system of appellate review

upheld in Proffitt was not required by the statute but was instead adopted by the Florida Supreme Court as a matter of case law.

Alabama does have a careful system of appellate review of death sentences which insures that the death penalty will not be inflicted arbitrarily or capriciously. As the Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals recognized in Mack v. State, 375 So. 2d 476, 500-501 (Ala. Cr. App. 1978), aff'd, 375 So. 2d 504 (Ala. 1979), the purpose of the requirement in § 13-11-4 that the trial court enter written findings of fact concerning aggravating and mitigating circumstances is to make appellate review of the sentencing decision possible. In reversing and remanding that case because the trial court did not enter "complete written findings as to the aggravating and mitigating circumstances," the Court of Criminal Appeals said, 375 So. 2d at 501:

> Unless and until this is done, "the trial judge cannot fairly weigh the aggravating and mitigating circumstances, and the appellate court cannot adequately review his sentencing decision." (Emphasis added.)

Accord, Herbert Lee Richardson v. State, _____ So. 2d _____ (Ala. Cr. App. 1978), aff'd, ____ So. 2d _____ (Ala. 1979); Jacobs v. State, 361 So. 2d 640, 646-647 (Ala. 1978) (separate opinion by Torbert, C. J.). As Chief Justice Torbert has also noted, in regard to the requirement for mandatory appellate review, "This mandatory review guarantees that, before a defendant can be executed in Alabama, the sentence of death must be found to be appropriate by both the Court of Criminal Appeals and this Court after a review of aggravating and mitigating circumstances found in the case by the trial judge."

361 So. 2d at 647 (Emphasis added). As the Court of Criminal Appeals explained in Beck v. State, 365 So. 2d at 1000:

> Under the new Alabama death penalty statute, the defendant has a second chance for life with the trial judge, a third with Court of Criminal Appeals, and a fourth with the Supreme Court of Alabama. Not only are decisions of the trial judge in death cases reviewed to insure a fair and impartial trial, but they will insure a consistency and uniformity of sentencing.

Appellate review of the substantive sentencing decision itself in cases in which the death penalty has been imposed is performed in two ways in Alabama — independent appellate weighing of the aggravating and mitigating circumstances to determine the appropriateness of the sentence and comparative review at the appellate level of the sentence with others which have been reviewed in similar cases. An example of a recent case in which the independent weighing of aggravating and mitigating circumstances at the appellate level was expressly revealed in the opinion is Thomas v. State, 373 So. 2d 1149, 1160 (Ala. Cr. App.), aff'd, 373 So. 2d 1167 (1979), where the Court of Criminal Appeals noted:

> The trial judge in his order noted the aggravating circumstances, which were here averred and proved at trial, and also determined by the trial judge in the postsentencing hearing, as required by law. Additionally, this Court has carefully weighed the aggravating and mitigating circumstances independently.
>
> We are of the opinion that the punishment here imposed fits the crime for which the appellant has been found duly guilty. (emphasis in original) (footnotes omitted)

Another example is Beck v. State, 365 So. 2d at 1005, where the appellate court stated:

> We have also considered the mitigating and aggravating circumstances and have found that under the facts of this case, death was the appropriate penalty.

The appropriateness of the sentence of death in view of all the facts and circumstances was also noted in Herbert Lee Richardson v. State, supra, Ms. Op. at 39-40. Indeed, in reviewing Ritter's own appeal, the Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals expressly noted that it had independently reviewed the appropriateness of the sentence. Evans v. State, 361 So. 2d at 662 ("In addition, this Court has weighed the aggravating and mitigating circumstances independently . . . and is of the opinion that the punishment here imposed fits the crime for which each appellant has been found guilty thereof.") In Neal v. State, 372 So. 2d 1331, 1347 (Ala. Cr. App.) (opinion of Bowen, Jr.), cert. denied, 372 So. 2d 1348 (Ala. 1979), Judge Bowen explained that, "this court must independently weigh the aggravating and mitigating circumstances to determine whether they are sufficient to support a sentence of death." No member of the Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals and no member of the Alabama Supreme Court has ever expressed any doubt about this or made any suggestion to the contrary.

In approving Florida's system of appellate review in Proffitt the court said, 428 U. S. at 259-260 (joint opinion):

> If a death sentence is imposed, the sentencing authority articulates in writing the statutory reasons that led to its decision. Those reasons, and the evidence supporting them, are conscientiously reviewed by a court which, because of its statewide jurisdiction, can assure consistency, fairness, and rationality in the evenhanded operation of the state law. As in Georgia, this system serves to assure that sentences of death will not be "wantonly" or "freakishly" imposed. . . .

In the words of Proffitt, Alabama's system of independently weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances on appeal "can assure consistency, fairness, and rationality in the evenhanded operation of the state law," because independent sentencing review by appellate courts of "statewide jurisdiction" will insure that sentences of death are not "wantonly" or "freakishly" imposed. Indeed, if anything, Alabama's system of appellate review is superior to Georgia's, because Georgia juries give no reasons for their sentencing decisions which can be reviewed at the appellate level. See, Woodson v. North Carolina, 428 U. S. at 318 (dissenting opinion of Rehnquist, J.). In Alabama, on the other hand, the sentencing authority is the trial judge and he is required to specify the aggravating and mitigating circumstances upon which his decision is based, and those factors are considered and weighed independently at the appellate court level.

In addition to independently weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances on appeal, the Alabama appellate courts also exercise comparative appellate review of capital sentences. Jacobs v. State, 361 So. 2d 607 (Ala. Cr. App. 1977), aff'd, 361 So. 2d 640 (Ala. 1978), was the first case under Alabama's post-Furman statute to reach the appellate level. Since there were no other cases under the new act with which to compare the death sentence in that case, Alabama's appellate courts compared it ot sentences in pre-Furman cases under Alabama's old capital punishment statute. This practice was expressly recognized in Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U. S. at 204,

n. 56 (1976) (joint opinion), as necessary and appropriate at the inception of a new statute. In Jacobs, 361 So. 2d at 632-633, the Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals noted:

> This is the first case under Alabama's new Death Penalty law to reach appellate review and unlike Georgia, Florida, and Texas we have no other cases with which we can compare the sentencing procedure to assure the consistency in the sentencing process. But that is not to say that we are without standards and guidelines to follow.
>
> . . . .
>
> Since the adoption of the Automatic Appeal Act in 1943 the Supreme Court of Alabama has reviewed approximately ninety-five death cases and has reversed twenty-five of them for various reasons, including excessive punishment, and where the verdict was contrary to the great preponderance of the evidence. Easley v. State, 246 Ala. 359, 20 So. 2d 519; Davis v. State, 245 Ala. 589, 18 So. 2d 282.

The Alabama Supreme Court in performing its comparative appellate review function in that same case noted, 361 So. 2d at 644, that:

> The Court of Criminal Appeals has spelled out specifically how death sentences, reviewed under Alabama's automatic appeal statute, have been reversed and the causes remanded for new trials. This Court has carefully reviewed each point raised by the accused in his petition, which was granted as a matter of right because of the sentence of death. We are familiar with other cases reviewed by this Court in the last decade involving death sentences and we are convinced that the sentence here was not arbitrarily or capriciously entered . . . .

Accord, Clements v. State, 370 So. 2d 708, 712-713 (Ala. Cr. App. 1978), rev'd on other grounds, 370 So. 2d 723 (Ala. 1979) (expressly rejecting the contention that Alabama's system did not provide for comparative appellate review of sentences).

Since the time of Jacobs, supra, more capital cases have reached the appellate level. This has made possible a comparison of the sentence under review with other sentences which have been reviewed under the same statute. An example of a case in which this comparative appellate review was explicitly performed in an appellate opinion is Beck v. State, supra, where the Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals held, 365 So. 2d at 1005:

> We have also considered the mitigating and aggravating circumstances and have found that under the facts of this case, death was the appropriate penalty.
>
> The facts in this case, after a careful evaluation, show a marked similarity with those in Jacobs v. State, supra.
>
> It seems to us that the result is inescapable that the punishment, too, should be the same.

It is true that Alabama appellate courts have not explicitly compared the circumstances of each capital case reviewed by them with the circumstances of other capital cases, but neither had the Florida appellate court at the time of Proffitt. See, Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U. S. at 259 (joint opinion) (noting that the Florida Supreme Court had performed comparative appellate review "several times"). Instead, the usual method of reviewing death sentences in Florida, as in Alabama, was by independent weighing of the aggravating and mitigating circumstances at the appellate level. See, Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U. S. at 253 (joint opinion).

It is also true that if a defendant elects not to appeal a sentence of life without parole that sentence and the facts underlying it will not formally come to the attention of the Alabama appellate courts for purposes of serving as an input for the process of comparative appellate review. However, although

appeal in life without parole cases is not automatic, it is available as a matter of right and many such cases are reviewed. E. g., Neal v. State, supra; Youngblood v. State, 372 So. 2d 34 (Ala. Cr. App. 1979); Evans (Leslie) v. State, 362 So. 2d 1284 (Ala. Cr. App. 1978); Prothro v. State, 370 So. 2d 740 (Ala. Cr. App. 1979); Tony Randolph Nolen v. State, _____ So. 2d _____ (Ala. Cr. App. 1979). In addition, it has never been held that a system of appellate review is defective if the comparative appellate review pool does not contain all capital cases in which a sentence of death was not imposed. Whether the proportionality review conducted by the Supreme Court of Georgia is "based solely upon capital sentences imposed, or upon all sentences imposed in cases where a capital sentence could have been imposed by law" is subject to "some disagreement." Woodson v. North Carolina, 428 U. S. at 317-318 (dissenting opinion of Rehnquist, J.). In addition, it was held in Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U. S. at 259, n. 16 (joint opinion), that even if the Florida Supreme Court did not review sentences of life imprisonment in capital cases and therefore might arguably have an "unbalanced view" of sentencing practices, "this problem is not sufficient to raise a serious risk that the state capital-sentencing system will result in arbitrary and capricious imposition of the death penalty."

Ritter argues based upon Tommy Lewis v. State, _____ So. 2d _____ (Ala. Cr. App. 1979), that Alabama appellate courts do not have the authority to vacate a death sentence and impose a sentence of life without parole themselves, and that that is a matter of constitutional concern. At most, the Lewis case establishes only that the procedure whereby the Alabama appellate courts revise a death sentence is by remand to the trial court

with orders to make a new sentence determination. In Lewis, a defendant was convicted of an intentional killing during the course of a robbery and sentenced to death. On appeal, after weighing the aggravating and mitigating circumstances independently, the Court of Criminal Appeals determined that the trial judge should not have sentenced the defendant to death. One judge thought that the appellate court should modify the sentence itself, while the other four were of the opinion that as a procedural matter the case should be remanded to the trial judge with a mandate to proceed to another sentencing determination. In reversing and remanding the trial court, the majority stated:

> As pointed out in Judge Clark's opinion, the death penalty is not sustained by the evidence presented at the hearing on aggravating and mitigating circumstances. However, this court does not have statutory authority to reduce the penalty and re-sentence the appellant itself. That duty is vested in the trial court, § 13-11-4, Code of Alabama 1975, subject to our review on appeal. "The judgment of conviction and sentence of death shall be subject to automatic review as now required by law." § 13-11-5, Code of Alabama 1975. Ms. Op. at 2 (Emphasis in opinion)

Upon remand, the trial court conducted another sentence hearing at which essentially the same evidence was considered, and then it imposed a sentence of life without parole. In doing so, the trial court noted that the Court of Criminal Appeals had concluded that the aggravating and mitigating circumstances, "require life imprisonment of Lewis without parole," and it quoted the parts of the appellate court's opinion which said that the sentence should not be death. Then the trial court stated as follows:

> The directions given the trial judge as the sentencing authority by the Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals in reversing the

> death sentence of Lewis are more than adequate to enable him to weigh the aggravating circumstances against the mitigating circumstances. The judgment rendered by this Court is founded upon the directions of The Alabama Court of Appeals that the sentence of death would not be sustained on evidence essentially the same as before the Court on the first sentencing hearing; the conclusion of this Court that the evidence now before the Court is essentially the same in nature which has been declared inadequate to sustain a sentence of death by The Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals; the aggravating circumstances; the mitigating circumstances found to exist by The Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals; and the mandate to this Court by The Alabama Court of Criminal Appeals recersing the sentence of death for the sum-normality of the mind of Lewis. (Emphasis added.)[7]

Whether the procedure followed by the four judges of the Court of Criminal Appeals in Lewis is correct or whether that court should have saved time by revising the sentence itself is a point which has not been decided by the Alabama Supreme Court. In any event, it does not matter. At most, the issue of who makes the formal entry that actually changes a sentence of death to one of life without parole is a procedural quibble. The important thing is that the sentence is changed from death to life without parole because the appellate court determined that the death sentence is not proper in the particular case.

The procedural issue does not in any way cloud the authority of the Alabama appellate courts to review the propriety of death sentences. This authority was re-asserted recently by the Alabama Supreme Court in State v. Debra Bracewell, ____ So. 2d _____ (Ala. 1979). In that case,

---

[7]From the November 13, 1979 sentencing order of the Circuit Court of Coffee County in State v. Tommy Lewis (Coffee County Case No. CC 77-25).

the Court of Criminal Appeals has reversed the capital conviction on a confession issue and it had not reached any of the other issues in the appeal. In reversing the Court of Criminal Appeals on the confession issue, the Alabama Supreme Court, Ms. Op. at 3, added:

> Upon remand of this cause, the Court of Criminal Appeals is instructed to further review the entire record of the proceedings below, including the propriety of the sentence of death. (Emphasis added)

In summary, the Alabama appellate courts do review the propriety of capital sentences, and in the words of Gregg, they do so "under a system that does not create a substantial risk of arbitrariness or caprice." 428 U. S. at 203.

IV. ALABAMA'S STATUTE OPERATES TO REQUIRE PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT OF AT LEAST ONE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCE AND ALL THE AGGRAVATING CIRCUMSTANCES CONSIDERED IN THIS CASE WERE PROVEN BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT

On p. 20 of his brief, Ritter argues that the Constitution requires that any aggravating circumstance considered in a capital sentencing decision be proven beyond a reasonable doubt. He cites no authority that has so held. In cases like Spinkellink v. Wainwright, 578 F. 2d 582, 610 (5th Cir. 1978), and State v. Simants, 197 Neb. 549, 250 N. W. 2d 881, 888 (1977), the issue was not reached because the statute involved was interpreted to avoid it.

Assuming for purposes of argument that an aggravating circumstance must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt, Alabama's statute meets that requirement. While Alabama's statute does not have an express provision explicitly requiring proof beyond a reasonable doubt of aggravating circumstances, neither did

the Florida statute upheld by this Court in Proffitt v. Florida, 428 U. S. 242 (1976), and by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in Spinkellink v. Wainwright, 578 F. 2d at 610, or the Nebrasks statute upheld in State v. Simants, 250 N. W. 2d at 888. Proffitt, Spinkellink, and Simants all establish that it is the operation and interpretation of the statute, not just its words, that is the proper inquiry.

The structure of Alabama's statute operates, as did the Florida statute examined in Proffitt v. Florida, supra, to require proof beyond a reasonable doubt of an aggravating circumstance before the death penalty may be imposed. Under Code of Alabama 1975, § 13-11-4(1), unless at least one aggravating circumstance is established the death penalty cannot be imposed. Jacobs (Jerry Wayne) v. State, 361 So. 2d at 631 ("If the trial judge in his written findings, determines that one or more of the aggravating circumstances attended the offense charged, then, and only then, can he impose the death sentence.") The state can and often will prove more than one aggravating circumstance, but it must prove at least one or there will automatically be a sentence of life without parole.

Because the definitions of the substantive capital offenses in Section 13-11-2(a) overlap almost completely with the list of aggravating circumstances in Section 13-11-6, the state must in virtually every case prove beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty at least one aggravating circumstance in order to get a conviction. For example, in proving a defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt and to a moral certainty of an intentional killing during the course of a robbery, which is a capital offense under Section 13-11-2 (a)(2), the state will also have proven beyond a reasonable

doubt and to a moral certainty that the capital felony was committed while the defendant was engaged in a robbery, which is an aggravating circumstance under Section 13-11-6(4). The statute itself recognizes this by providing in Section 13-11-4 that the court must set forth as the basis for the sentence imposed, "findings of fact from the trial and the sentence hearing." The same is true of the remaining capital offenses defined in the statute. If the state does not prove them beyond a reasonable doubt, then there will be an acquittal. If the state does prove any of them sufficiently to obtain a conviction that same proof will establish at least one and sometimes more than one aggravating circumstance beyond a reasonable doubt. It is conceivable that one could strain the imagination and conjure up a theoretically possible case in which there is not a factual overlap between the definition of the capital offense proven and at least one of the aggravating circumstances, but this Court's determination should be based on reality rather than on conjecture and speculation.

It is true that in some cases after the sentence hearing is held the trial judge will find and consider aggravating circumstances in addition to those which are proved beyond a reasonable doubt during the trial as a necessary part of the state's case for conviction of the capital crime. Ritter contends that those additional aggravating circumstances should also be proven beyond a reasonable doubt and that therefore the Alabama statute should be struck down. This argument has three major defects.

First, no case has held that all of the aggravating circumstances considered by the sentencing authority, as opposed to at least one of them, must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

Second, even if the constitution does require that every aggravating circumstance considered by the sentencing authority be proven beyond a reasonable doubt, Alabama's statute can be so interpreted. While the statute does not contain an express requirement to that effect, neither did the Florida statute upheld in Proffitt. The Alabama Supreme Court has not held that all mitigating circumstances considered by the trial judge must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt, but it has not held to the contrary either. The issue has not been addressed by it, but construing statutes to avoid constitutional issues is a principle of statutory construction which is well recognized by the Alabama Supreme Court. See, e. g., Pruett v. Patton, 288 Ala. 710, 265 So. 2d 130, 133 (1972); Ex parte Hughley Water System, 282 Ala. 633, 213 So. 2d 799, 805 (Ala. 1968). This case did not raise the issue because the trial judge in fact applied such a standard and all of the aggravating circumstances he found and considered were not only proven beyond a reasonable doubt but were undisputed, admitted, and confessed.

That is the third reason for rejecting Ritter's argument on this issue. The trial judge in fact applied a beyond a reasonable doubt or even higher standard of proof to ascertainment of the aggravating circumstances. That is evident from his refusal to find as an aggravating circumstance

that the crime was, in the words of Section 13-11-6(8), "especially heinous, atrocious, or cruel." The trial judge noted:

> While in the personal opinion of the Court, the Capital Felony was especially heinous or atrocious the Court has no precedent or authority which would allow it to hold as a matter of law that this Capital Felony meets the test of being especially heinous or atrocious or cruel, as set out in Section (h) of Section 6 of Act 213, and so the Court makes no finding on this point. (R. 244-245) (Emphasis added.)

Therefore, the trial judge did not find or consider that particular aggravating circumstance in reaching his sentencing decision, because he could not convince himself of it sufficiently to hold that it existed "as a matter of law", a burden of persuasion which is if anything even higher than beyond a reasonable doubt. In addition, the aggravating circumstances which were found and considered by the trial judge were proven beyond a reasonable doubt. In fact, they were undisputed, confessed, and admitted by Ritter at every available opportunity. Accordingly, as the Nebraska Supreme Court held in Simants, 250 N. W. 2d at 888, "That question is not involved in this case because the aggravating circumstances found to exist here were clearly found to exist beyond a reasonable doubt."

In summary, Alabama's statute like Florida's operates to effectively require proof beyond a reasonable doubt of at least one aggravating circumstance before the death penalty can be imposed. If more is consitutionally required, the Alabama statute can be interpreted to provide it. In any event, the aggravating circumstances considered in the sentence hearing in this case were not only proven beyond a reasonable doubt but were undisputed, admitted, and confessed by Ritter.

V. THE OVERALL OPERATION OF ALABAMA'S STATUTE IS NOT UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND IT DID NOT OPERATE TO PREJUDICE RITTER IN ANY WAY

Apparently feeling that the whole is different from the sum of its parts, Ritter argues that the overall operation of Alabama's capital punishment statute is unconstitutional. That argument should be rejected for the same reasons that Ritter's arguments against the individual parts of the statute should be rejected. In considering Ritter's statement that the Alabama statute is a "veritable engine of death," this Court should be mindful of the Statement of Facts in this brief. If there was any "engine" at work in obtaining the death sentence for Ritter, that engine was relentlessly driven by Ritter himself. Against the persistent advice of his attorneys and even of the trial court, Ritter repeatedly confessed and admitted the charges against him and pleaded guilty at every available opportunity. He insisted to the grand jury, to the trial jury, and to the judge sitting as the sentencing authority that he preferred a sentence of death. Ritter has even made that boast at various stages of other appellate litigation involving his case. Having obtained what he so earnestly sought and so richly deserves, it is hardly appropriate for Ritter to blame the result on Alabama's statute.

VI. THE PETITIONER KNOWINGLY AND VOLUNTARILY WAIVED ANY ERRORS IN THE COURT'S CHARGE TO THE JURY

The petitioner argues that the constitutional implication of the trial court's failure to charge the jury as to the elements of robbery in the instant case so fatally flawed the determination of guilt by the jury as to merit review by this Court. The respondent would take exception with this view for a variety of reasons.

First of all it is apparent from the record in this case that Wayne Ritter knowingly and voluntarily waived any errors in the Court's charge. The petitioner was represented by counsel throughout the proceedings and despite the warnings of his counsel and in fact over his counsel's objection the petitioner insisted upon pleading guilty and assisting the state throughout the proceedings. (R. 48 - 61, 207 - 208, 216 - 222).

Prior to his arraignment in the instant case the petitioner filed a "motion of intent to enter guilty plea." (R. 21) Among the grounds asserted in this motion was "that the defendant has openly and publicly admitted his guilt after being advised of his constitutional rights numerous times, and still admits his guilt as charged in both indictments." (R. 21).

At the time he was arraigned the peitioner after being fully advised of his rights under both the United States Constitution and state law entered a plea of guilty. (R. 48 - 61) The trial judge did not accept the guilty plea but as is required by Alabama law set the matter for presentation to the jury. (R. 60 - 61)

At the trial of the case the State presented its case in considerable detail and showed each of the elements of robbery. (R. 97 - 106, 108 - 113, 115 - 120, 124 - 128, 131 - 133, 156 - 162, 184 - 187, 190 - 194, 196 - 199). The petitioner then took the stand and admitted the robbery and murder and testified concerning the details of the robbery and murder. (R. 216 - 222)

It is thus clear that for whatever reason Wayne Ritter had decided to admit his participation in the crime with which he was charged and to assist the State in the presentation of it's case. The petitioner had clearly decided against the advice of counsel to waive all those constitutional rights to which he was entitled. Thus there can be no other conclusion than that the petitioner in not objecting to the Court's charge to the jury was knowingly and voluntarily waiving any errors in that charge.

That such a waiver of rights can occur is not open to question. Defendants when entering guilty pleas are regularly allowed to waive the entire panoply of constitutional rights. The petitioner attempted to do just that by entering a plea of guilty.

The Alabama Supreme Court specifically found that there was a knowing and voluntary waiver of any error in the trial court's oral charge. Ritter v. State, 375 So. 2d 270, 275-276 (Ala. 1979) Such a knowing and voluntary waiver of rights does not present a ground for review by this Court.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the petition for a writ of certiorari should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles A. Graddick

CHARLES A. GRADDICK
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Jack M. Curtis

JACK M. CURTIS
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

ADDRESS OF COUNSEL:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
250 ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDING
64 NORTH UNION STREET
MONTGOMERY, AL 36130

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have served a copy of the foregoing Brief in Opposition for a Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Alabama on the Attorney for Petitioner, Honorable John L. Carroll, by depositing the same in the United States Postal Service, duly stamped and addressed as follows:

Honorable John L. Carroll
1001 South Hull Street
Montgomery, AL 36104

DONE on this the 31 date of December, 19 79.

Jack M. Curtis
JACK M. CURTIS
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL